

Group II: Claims 7, 11, 55, 57 and their dependent claims, directed to voucher handling, class 713, subclass 156.

Group III: Claims 14, 19, 59, 62, 99, 102 and their dependent claims, directed to content key handlings with public key, class 380, subclass 282.

Group IV: Claims 23, 66, 106 and their dependent claims, directed to content key handlings with watermarking, class 713, subclass 176.

Group V: Claims 47, 87, and 120 and their dependent claims, directed to encryption handlings with domain traversal and usage records, class 726, subclass 7”.

Applicants provisionally elect for prosecution the invention of Group II (claims 7, 11, 55, 57 and their dependent claims). Additionally, Applicants respectfully observe that the Restriction Requirement appears to not reference claims 95-98, and respectfully submit that Group II should further include claims 95-98.

However, Applicants believe that the Restriction Requirement is improper and therefore make this election with traverse.

Applicants respectfully submit that, as stated in MPEP §803, for a restriction requirement to be proper “there are two criteria for restriction between patentably distinct inventions” as follows:

- (1) The inventions must be independent or distinct as claimed; and
- (2) There would be a serious burden on the examiner if restriction is not required.

Applicants respectfully submit that: all groups of restricted claims are properly

presented in the same application; undue diverse searching would not be required; and all claims should be examined together. Accordingly, examination of the claims of Groups I, III, IV, and V, in addition to the claims of Group II, would place no additional “serious” burden on the Examiner as examination of the claims of Groups I, III, IV, and V would not require undue diverse searching beyond that which would be necessary for examination of the claims of Group II.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the restriction requirement should be withdrawn and that all claims should be examined on the merits.

(Continued on next page)

AUTHORIZATION

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees which may be required for this response, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 13-4500, Order No. 4208-4040. **A DUPLICATE OF THIS DOCUMENT IS ATTACHED.**

Furthermore, in the event that an extension of time is required, the Commissioner is requested to grant a petition for that extension of time which is required to make this Response timely, and is hereby authorized to charge any fee for such an extension of time or credit any overpayment for an extension of time to the above-noted Deposit Account and Order No.

Respectfully submitted,

MORGAN & FINNEGAN, L.L.P.

Dated: February 24, 2006

By: _____


Angus R. Gill

Registration No. 51,133

Mailing address:
MORGAN & FINNEGAN, L.L.P.
3 World Financial Center
New York, New York 10281-2101
(212) 415-8700
(212) 415-8701 (Fax)